



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/824,005	04/03/2001	Hirotake Watanabe	010368	6459

38834 7590 07/07/2004

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

SORRELL, ERON J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2182

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/824,005

Applicant(s)

WATANABE, HIROTAKE

Examiner

Eron J Sorrell

Art Unit

2182

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04032001
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

Art Unit: 2182

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. Claim 1 recites the limitation "said network device" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levi (U.S. Patent No. 6,658,586) in view of Shimura (U.S. Patent No. 5,785,041).

6. Referring to method claims 1 and 3, systems claim 5,7, and 8, and apparatus claim 9, Levi teaches a system and method for managing a plurality of network devices comprising the steps of:

setting identification information to said network device by assigning identification information to each network device by means of management equipment (server) (see abstract and lines 5-19 of column 2); and

indicating the network device with the identifier which is the same as said identification information onto a screen for network device management in said management equipment (see lines see paragraph bridging columns 8 and 9).

Levi fails to teach the limitation of outputting said identification information visually on the operation panel of the network device.

Shimura teaches the above limitation in a printer that (see lines 50-57 of column 3) allows for ability to designate a printing operation for a special printer only (see lines 40-44 of column 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to

Art Unit: 2182

modify the system and method of Levi with the above teachings of Shimura in order to print to a special printer only, as suggested by Shimura.

7. Referring to method claim 2, system claim 6, and apparatus claim 10, Levi teaches the setting step comprises the steps of:

retrieving a database having said identification information related to each network device (see lines 33-63 of column 8); and

assigning said identification information automatically to said network device (see lines 33-63 of column 8).

8. Referring to method claim 4 and apparatus claim 11, the combination of Levi and Shimura fails to explicitly set forth the limitation that the identifier comprises a primary identifier and a secondary identifier respectively including a color and letter, however Shimura does disclose the identification information should be peculiar to each device (see abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the combination of Levi and Shimura such that the identification information comprises a primary identifier and a secondary

Art Unit: 2182

identifier respectively includes a color and letter in order to uniquely distinguish the printers from one another.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following references were cited to further show the state of the art as it pertains to network device management:

U.S. Patent No. 6,425,007 to Messinger teaches managing a network from a management station that displays on the screen of the management station, a logical representation and device ID of all of the network devices.

U.S. Patent No. to Hansen et al. teaches comparing device ID to a device ID database to determine changes in the network topology.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eron J Sorrell whose telephone number is 703 305-7800. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A Gaffin can be reached on 703 308-3301. The fax phone number for the


Art Unit: 2182

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EJS

June 29, 2004


JEFFREY GAFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100